

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-29, 31, 46 and 48-50 are pending in the present application. No Claims have been amended, canceled or added. Thus, no new issues have been presented.

Applicants thank the Examiner for allowing Claims 11-14, 17, 18, 31-33, 37, 41 and 45. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating Claims 3-10, 15, 16, 22, 35, 36, 39, 40, 43, 44 and 50 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The 10/5/2005 Office Action rejected Claims 1, 19-21, 23-29, 34, 38, 42, 46, 48 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sourour (U.S. Patent No. 6,865,218).

Applicants thank the Examiner for discussing Claim 1 and Sourour on 11/28/05 with Applicants. As discussed, Sourour discloses a method of reducing “multipath signal interference” (Abstract; Summary, col. 2, lines 49-54; col. 3, lines 18-30). For example, col. 2, lines 52-54 of Sourour states:

“The interference estimation RAKE function generates multipath interference estimates for each of the signals output by the primary RAKE fingers. After scaling and combining, all the path interference estimates are subtracted from the combined signal of interest to reduce multipath interference in the combined signal of interest.”

Sourour does not disclose or teach “estimating pilot interference” and “canceling pilot interference,” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 1. Sourour mentions a “pilot channel” in col. 3, lines 40-45, but these lines describe “channel estimates that are readily updateable based on the pilot channel.” These lines do not disclose or teach “canceling pilot interference,” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 1.

Sourour also mentions a “pilot channel” in col. 7, lines 7-15, but these lines describe estimating “propagation path characteristics.” These lines do not disclose or teach “canceling pilot interference,” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 1.

For at least this reason, Claim 1 and all its dependent Claims should be allowable. Independent Claims 34, 38, 42 and 46 and their dependent Claims should also be allowable for this reason.


In addition, Sourour does not disclose or teach “accumulating estimated pilot interference due to the plurality of signal instances in a buffer to provide a total pilot interference,” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 1. The Office Action cited “summing circuit 218” in Fig. 7 of Sourour as disclosing or teaching the “buffer” in Claims 1, 34, 38, 42 and 46. Sourour does not disclose that “summing circuit 218” in Fig. 7 can “accumulat[e] estimated pilot interference due to the plurality of signal instances,” as recited in Claim 1. Thus, for at least this reason, independent Claims 1, 34, 38, 42 and 46 and their dependent Claims should be allowable.

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/28/2005

By: 
Alex C. Chen, Reg. No. 45, 591
(858) 651-5363

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 651-4125
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502